

**REMARKS**

1. The Office Action has objected to the drawings as not including the reference number 38, referring to the frame members of the stroller. In response thereto, Applicants are submitting herewith a Letter to the Official Draftsman's Office to present a replacement Fig. 7 on which the reference number 38 has been added. A marked up copy of this replacement sheet with the added reference number and lead line in red have been submitted with this Amendment for the Examiner's approval of this drawing correction.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2. The Office Action has rejected Claims 3, 4 and 14 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. More particularly, the Office Action states that the limitation of the detachable mounting member is indefinite as it is unclear as to how the mounting member can be detachable from the floor member of the container. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response, Applicant would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendment of Claims 3 and 14 to better define Applicants' invention in more definite terms. These claim amendments make it clear that the mounting members are used to detachably mount the floor support when the floor support is mounted within the pockets on the underside of the floor member of the container. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3. The Office Action has rejected Claims 1 – 4 and 11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,577,903 (Wells) in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,506,903 (Bowermaster) and further in view of U. S. Patent No. D319,132 (Marquardt) and U. S. Patent No. 5,429,254 (Challoner). The Office Action states that Wells teaches a wheeled carriage with a cloth container mounted to the carriage, while Bowermaster teaches that an accessory for a wheeled carriage can be formed with wheels to support the accessory on the ground, Marquadt teaches the use of a rigid floor support beneath a bag, and Challoner teaches that a rigid floor support with a plurality of wheels can be attached to the bottom of a bag. The Office Action concludes that it would be obvious to modify the accessory of Wells to provide a rigid floor support as taught by Marquardt and mounting the floor support as taught by Challoner in order to reduce stress and weight applied to the carriage as taught by Bowermaster. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the amendments made to independent Claims 1 and 11 above to define an accessory for a wheeled carriage, such as a child's stroller, that is supported simultaneously both from the hand grips of the wheeled carriage by the attachment devices and by the wheels of the rigid floor support that engage the surface of the ground while the accessory is in the operating position and mounted on the frame of the wheeled carriage. Applicants respectfully submit that an important aspect of their invention is the wheeled rigid floor support that is mounted in to the underside of the floor member and engagable with the ground while mounted on the wheeled carriage. This wheeled floor support supports the majority of the weight of the container and any articles carried within the container to permit the container to follow behind the wheeled carriage.

Applicants have also submitted a new independent Claim 21 that defines an accessory in terms that include a container with a rigid floor support and a mounting member operable to wrap around the floor support for detachable engagement thereof when the floor support is engaged within the pocket on the underside of the floor member to fix the container in the upright operative configuration. The mounting member is alternatively positionable to wrap around the container when collapsed against said floor member in a transport configuration.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references, whether used singly or in combination, cannot meet or make obvious Applicants' invention as defined by independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, as amended. More particularly, none of these references contain any teaching for a container accessory for a wheeled carriage that is supported both by the attachment devices mounting the container to the hand grips of the wheeled carriage and by the wheeled rigid floor support engaged with the surface of the ground.

As noted in the Office Action, while Wells does teach a wheeled carriage having a container accessory mounted on the hand grips of the carriage, Wells does not teach the support of the container accessory by a wheeled rigid floor support that engages the surface of the ground. Bowermaster contains no teaching for a cloth container accessory at all. In fact, the wheeled device connected to the wheeled carriage is a conventional oxygen tank carrier. Furthermore, Bowermaster contains no suggestion or teaching whatsoever that the container has a rigid floor support to support the weight of the contents of a flexible cloth bag that is simultaneously mounted on the frame of the wheeled carriage.

Adding Marquardt and Challoner to the combination does not provide the missing teaching or suggestion that will make the invention defined by independent Claims 1, 11 and 21 obvious. Marquardt does suggest a rigid wheeled floor support, but not one that is mounted in

the floor of a flexible cloth container that is supported on the back of a wheeled carriage. Furthermore, Marquardt contains no teaching or suggestion that a flexible bag can be simultaneously supported by attachment devices connected to the frame of a wheeled carriage while the rigid floor support supports the weight of the bag on the surface of the ground. Similarly, Challoner is directed to a carrying case for a skateboard and contains no teaching or suggestion whatsoever with respect to a container accessory for a wheeled carriage in which the accessory is supported simultaneously from the frame of the carriage and on the surface of the ground.

With respect to new independent Claim 21, none of these references contain any teaching or suggestion for the use of a mounting member that is alternatively positionable around the rigid floor support when the container accessory is in an operating configuration and around the collapsed container when the accessory is in a transport configuration.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination cannot meet or make obvious Applicant's invention as defined by amended independent Claims 1 and 11 or by newly submitted independent Claim 21. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4. The Office Action has rejected Claims 5 – 8 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination, still further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,672,321 (Hamilton). The Office Action states that Hamilton teaches that a flexible bag accessory can be mounted to a wheeled carriage with hook and loop fasteners. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In addition to the comments expressed above with respect to the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination, Applicants further submit that Hamilton adds nothing to the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination to meet the limitations of amended independent Claims 1 and 11, or of newly submitted independent Claim 21. Hamilton contains no teaching that a flexible bag can be simultaneously supported from the carriage frame by attachment devices and on the surface of the ground by a wheeled floor support. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hamilton contains no teaching or suggestion of a mounting member that would alternatively wrap around the floor support or the collapsed flexible container. Since rejected Claims 5 – 8 depend from amended Claim 1, these claims contain the limitations found therein. Applicants request that these claims be passed to allowance with the independent claim from which they depend.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

5. The Office Action has also rejected Claim 8 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Hamilton combination, further in view of U. S. Patent No. 1,844,872 (Shipman). The Office Action states that Shipman teaches the use of stiffening rods in a suspended fabric bag or container. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since Claim 8 depends from amended independent Claim 1, and since Shipman adds nothing to the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Hamilton combination to meet or make obvious the invention defined by amended independent Claim 1, as set forth in the

preceding Paragraphs, Applicants respectfully request that Claim 8 be passed to allowance with Claim 1.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

6. The Office Action has rejected Claims 9, 10 and 12 – 14 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination, further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,186,662 (Jackson). The Office Action states that Jackson teaches that a portion of the upright walls of the cloth container can be formed of a mesh or netting material to permit viewing of the contents of the container. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These dependent claims contain the limitations set forth in amended independent Claims 1 and 11, respectively. Since Jackson adds nothing to the teachings of the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner combination to meet the limitations set forth in these amended independent claims, Applicants respectfully request that these claims be passed to allowance with Claims 1 and 11.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

7. The Office Action has rejected Claims 15 – 18 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Jackson combination, further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,672,321 (Hamilton). The Office Action states

that Hamilton teaches the mounting of a flexible bag device to the frame of a wheeled carriage using hook and loop fasteners. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These dependent claims contain the limitations set forth in amended independent Claim 11. Since Hamilton adds nothing to the teachings of the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Jackson combination to meet the limitations set forth in these amended independent claims, Applicants respectfully request that these claims be passed to allowance with Claim 11.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

8. The Office Action has also rejected Claim 18 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Jackson/Hamilton combination, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 1,844,872 (Shipman). The Office Action states that Shipman teaches the use of stiffening rods to maintain a suspended bag container in an open configuration. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above with respect to the rejection of Claim 8, Shipman adds nothing to the applied combination of six references to meet the limitations of amended independent Claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this claim be passed to allowance with Claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

9. The Office Action has rejected Claims 19 and 20 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wells/Bowermaster/Marquardt/Challoner/Jackson/Hamilton/Shipman combination, further in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,702,038 (Jackson) and U. S. Patent No. 5,863,061 (Ziegler). The Office Action states that Miller teaches that accessories can be suspended from the handles of a stroller, while Ziegler teaches that strollers can be collapsed into a transport configuration. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Miller nor Ziegler add anything to the multiple reference combination to meet the limitations of independent Claim 11, as amended. Furthermore, although Ziegler teaches that a stroller can be collapsed into a transport configuration, there is no teaching that the accessory in the form of a flexible cloth container suspended from the handles of the stroller by attachment devices and supported on the surface of the ground by a wheeled floor support member can be collapsed with the stroller for storage therewith. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claims be passed to allowance with Claim 11.

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

10. In summary, the Office Action has cited several multiple reference combinations that are purported to render Applicants' invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). However, none of the references, whether taken singly or in combination, contain the teaching necessary to meet or make obvious a flexible bag container that is mountable on the frame of a wheeled carriage by attachment devices while being supported on the ground by a wheeled floor support

member that is captured by the floor portion of the container. This container configuration provides a unique accessory for utilization with a wheeled carriage like a stroller or even a wheel chair such that loose items can be stored within the container and supported on the frame of the carriage and by the floor support member in a manner that the container travels along with the wheeled carriage.

Furthermore, the primary combination of references cited in the rejections of independent Claims 1 and 11 have no suggestion within the references for making the proposed combination. For example, the Challoner reference is a carrying case for a skateboard, which can be collapsed into a fanny pack for storage while the skateboard is in use. This Challoner carrying case has a shoulder strap and hook-and-loop fastener strips for encircling the skateboard, but there is simply no suggestion within this reference that the carrying case can be used in conjunction with a storage container mounted on a wheeled carriage. The Challoner carrying case is not utilized while the skateboard is supported on the ground, only when elevated off the ground for transport.

Similarly, the Marquardt reference contains no suggestion that the rigid cart can be used to support a flexible bag container that is suspended from a wheeled carriage, such as a stroller. The Marquardt wheeled cart is not attached to a flexible container, let alone one that is suspended from the handle grips of a stroller. The Marquardt cart does not teach or suggest that the use of the cart can help support items placed within a flexible container to permit the container to be trailed along behind a wheeled carriage without impeding the utilization of the wheeled carriage.

Wells presents a flexible bag storage container supported solely on the handle grips of a wheeled carriage (wheelchair). It is this kind of storage container to which Applicants'

invention represents an improvement. The Wells container is limited in capacity due to the sole support being from attachment strips engaged with the handle grips of the wheelchair. If the Wells storage container is overloaded, the wheelchair becomes more difficult to operate and to remain in a stable condition. With Applicants apparatus, as defined by independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, filling the container to its full capacity will not impede substantially the use of the wheeled carriage due to the support of a majority of the weight on the wheeled floor support member.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that amended independent Claims 1 and 11, as well as newly submitted independent Claim 21, and the dependent claims depending from Claims 1 and 11, patentably distinguish the cited prior art references. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn and all remaining claims be passed to allowance.

11.           Applicants would direct the Examiner's attention to the addition of independent Claim 21 to the application. Applicants respectfully submit that no filing fees are required by the addition of Claim 21 as this is the third independent claim presented for examination and, with the cancellation of Claim 19 from the application, only 20 total claims are presented for examination.


12.           In summary, Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 14 and 20 have been amended, Claim 19 has been canceled, Claim 21 has been added, and Claims 1 – 18, 20 and 21 remain in the application. Applicants believe that the claims are allowable based on the foregoing amendments. Applicants

respectfully request that all objections and rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn and that all claims remaining in this case be allowed.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call the undersigned attorney if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the case ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 15, 2005



---

Larry W. Miller  
Registration No. 29,417  
Attorney for Applicants  
Miller Law Group, PLLC  
25 Stevens Avenue  
West Lawn, PA 19609  
Phone: 610-670-9000  
Fax: 610-670-9901



## Replacement Sheet

Fig. 7

